

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, and 15 have been amended and claim 18 has been added herein. This Response, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated December 1, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cahill et al. (U.S. 2002/0099574 A1; henceforth “Cahill”) and further in view of Panico (U.S. 2003/0162536 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejections and respectfully submits that the claims are allowable for all of the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 recites:

A camping facility reservation method, for making a camping facility reservation, comprising:

storing respective camping pad attribute information for camping pads of a . camping facility;

storing camping vehicle attribute information for a given camping vehicle; obtaining reservation request information concerning the camping facility and the given camping vehicle; and

providing an indication of one or more candidate camping pads based on the respective camping pad attribute information of the camping pads of the camping facility and the camping vehicle attributes for the given camping vehicle,

wherein the camping pad attribute information includes information regarding the location and availability of at least one of water and sewer connections on the camping pad.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Cahill discloses storing camping pad attribute information for camping pads, obtaining reservation request information, and providing

an indication of one or more camping pads based on attribute information. However, the Examiner acknowledges that Cahill does not teach storing camping vehicle attributes for a given camping vehicle, but instead asserts that Panico cures this deficiency. Applicant submits that the Examiner has misconstrued the applied references.

In the previously filed response, Applicant argued that Cahill and Panico are directed to reserving and assigning parking spaces. Applicant further argued that Cahill and Panico are not directed to the reservation of camping pads as these references do not recognize the unique issues related to the reservation of camping pad. More specifically, Applicant argued that parking spaces are fundamentally different from camping pads because parking spaces for vehicles are designed to store a vehicle while the occupant is elsewhere (i.e. the user parks the car and goes elsewhere without the car). Conversely, a camping pad is designed to accommodate a camping vehicle and a resident of the camping vehicle. Further, the camping pad is designed to provide a user with amenities necessary for camping. Parking spaces, as discussed in Cahill and Panico, are not designed for a camping vehicle or for camping. Also, the prior art cited by the Examiner does not teach a reservation system which takes into consideration the unique requirements necessary for reserving camping pads for camping vehicles.

Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that neither of these references teach or even fairly suggest storing information on the location and availability of water or sewer connection information at parking spaces. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the neither Cahill, nor Panico teach or even suggest “the camping pad attribute information includes information regarding the location and availability of at least one of water and sewer connections on the

camping pad” as claimed. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and all claims are patentable over these applied references. Further, to the extent that claim 15 recites similar subject matter, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15, and all claims dependant thereon are patentable for analogous reasons.

Further, claim 2 recites:

...wherein the camping vehicle attribute information comprises one or more of:
tip-out portion particulars,
wherein the tip-out portion particulars includes information on location and dimensions of the tip-out portions;
location of connections for hook-ups on the camping vehicle; and
tolerance for slopes...

Applicant respectfully submits that Cahill and Panico do not teach or even suggest storing information on tip-out portions, including location and dimensions, as a well as the location of connections to hook-ups. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that these references also do not teach the features of claim 2 and claim 2 is therefore patentable over the applied references.

Claim 13

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cahill and further in view of Panico and further in view of Inokuchi (U.S. 2004/0080510 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 13 recites “wherein the camping vehicle attribute information comprises the number of people who will be staying at the camping facility”. In rejecting this claim, the Examiner acknowledges that neither Cahill nor Panico teach this feature. However, the

Examiner asserts that Inokuchi cures this deficiency. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has misconstrued the applied references.

Inokuchi is directed to a information display panel and provides no teachings related to a reservation system for camping pads. Further, though Inokuchi may describe providing information on a number of users in a particular area, this has no relevance to making a reservation or how many people will be using a particular camping pad. Instead, this information relates to providing information on objects of interest for a particular area. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the applied references do not teach the unique features recited in claim 13.

Further, claim 13 depends from claim 1, which has been shown above to be patentable over the Cahill and Panico references. The Inokuchi reference does not cure any of the above discussed deficiencies. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is also patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

For all the above discussed reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the above discussed claims be withdrawn.

Newly Added Claims

Claim 18 has been added herein and depends from claim 15, which has been shown above to be patentable over the applied references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. Further, Applicant also submits that none of the applied references teach or even fairly suggest the

unique features recited therein. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that these claims be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880 via EFS payment screen. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael C. Jones/

Michael C. Jones
Registration No. 63,266

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 2, 2009